UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/468,222	12/20/1999	DAVID ALLEN	002880.P001C	3372

7590   02/27/2004

James H Salter
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER
LE, UYEN T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2171	

DATE MAILED: 02/27/2004

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 February 2004</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1 and 21-49</u> is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1 and 21-49</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   Applicant seems to argue the claims as amended. Applicant's arguments regarding Register have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2.   Claims 27-31, 35, 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention because:

- claim 27, line 1 "the action" lacks antecedent basis

- claim 28, line 3 "the selected information" lacks antecedent basis

- claim 30, last line "the selected action" lacks antecedent basis

- claim 31, line 2 "the selection", line 4 "the desired action" lack antecedent basis

- claim 35, line 2 "the action" lacks antecedent basis

- claim 45, line 2 "the detected information" lacks antecedent basis.

The art rejection of claims 27, 28, 30, 31, 35, 45 is applied as best understood in light of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph discussed above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3.   Claims 1, 21-28, 30-36, 39, 42-46, 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a), (e) as being anticipated by Ohmaye et al (US 5,544,305).

Regarding claim 1, Ohmaye discloses an apparatus for responding to a message entered by a user in a computer system including a user input device for receiving an input message from the user and user output device to present information to the user (see Figure 1). The claimed parser is met when Ohmaye shows that the input is parsed for a keyword (see column 3, lines 11-28). Clearly the keyword is associated with an information object since the system creates an interactive simulation based on the user input keyword (see the abstract).

Regarding claim 21, the apparatus of Ohmaye clearly detects a keyword immediately upon the completion of a keyword (see column 3, lines 11-28).

Regarding claim 22, the system has to reparse as claimed in order to detect completion of a keyword.

Regarding claim 23, Ohmaye discloses a set of information objects, each designed to execute one or more actions when triggered by the user when Ohmaye shows the interactive simulation (see the abstract).

Regarding claim 24, clearly the action is based upon the contents of the input message since the input message contains a keyword associated with an information object.

Regarding claims 25, 26, Ohmaye discloses combining data from the input message with data extracted from other sources determined by the particular information object comprising querying one or more data sources (see Figure 16).

Claim 27 merely reads on the fact that as the user inputs the message, it is displayed on the output device (see Figure 1).

Claim 28 is met by the fact that the system of Ohmaye presents an interactive simulation to the user (see the abstract).

Claim 30 is met when Ohmaye shows Figure 3.

Claim 31 is met by the fact that the system of Ohmaye allows users to create new objects (see Figure 6).

Claim 32 is met when Ohmaye shows that the system parses the input and accepts the input if it finds the keywords in the input statement (see column 3, lines 25-28). Clearly if no keyword is found, the system has to enable the user to select an information object from a list of available information objects in order to assist the user.

Regarding claim 33, Ohmaye discloses the list of keywords and actions each invokes for the user's review (see Figure 5).

Regarding claim 34, Ohmaye teaches the concept of alias keywords used to invoke information objects when Ohmayes shows alternate keywords input by the users (see column 3, lines 11-28).

Claim 35 merely reads on the fact that the system of Ohmaye outputs execution results to the user (see the abstract).

Regarding claim 36, Ohmaye discloses a system as claimed (see the abstract). The claimed object database reads on items 20, 22 in the system of Ohmaye. The claimed user interface reads on item 24. The claimed user output device reads on item 16. Furthermore, Ohmaye discloses a parser operating as claimed (see column 3, lines 11-28).

Regarding claim 39, Ohmayes discloses querying a data source (see Figure 12).

Regarding claim 42, Ohmyes discloses aliases for the keyword created by the user to enable customization when Ohmayes shows alternate keywords input by the users (see column 3, lines 11-28).

Claim 43 merely reads on the fact that the simulation system of Ohmaye is interactive (see the abstract, Figure 7).

Regarding claim 44, Ohmaye discloses continuously parsing user input message to immediately detect the keyword (see column 3, lines 11-28).

Regarding claims 45, 46, the detected information merely reads on the fact that the keyword included in the user input message is displayed as the user inputs the message.

Regarding claim 49, Ohmaye discloses a method to respond to a message including receiving an input message from a user, identifying a keyword in the input message, associating the input message with an information object associated with the

keyword and presenting information to the user based on the information object (see the

abstract, column 2, line 19- column 3, line 28).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 29, 37, 38, 40, 41, 47, 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Ohmaye et al (US 5,544,305).

Regarding claim 29, although Ohmaye does not specifically show the claimed

features, since the system is interactive, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art to include a mechanism to override selected information objects in order

to allow users to simulate using other objects as desired.

Regarding claims 37, 38, although Ohmaye does not specifically show a client

and server as claimed, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to

include the claimed features in order to allow remote users to access the system from

various geographical areas.

Regarding claim 40, although Ohmaye does not specifically show triggering a

second information object on a remote server, it is well known in the art to store

information at servers for distribution to users. Therefore, it would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art to include the claimed features in order to search remote

servers for the desired objects when not found locally.

Regarding claim 41, although Ohmaye does not specifically show overriding the selection of the information object, since the system is interactive, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include a mechanism to override selected information objects in order to allow users to simulate using other objects as needed.

Regarding claims 47, 48, although Ohmaye does not specifically show a first and second user interface for sending and receiving messages including a header as claimed, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the claimed features in order to allow sharing of information among users.

Conclusion

5.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Crick (US 5,339,432) teaches providing user control of device drive configuration.

Jones (US 6,360,280) teaches accessing shell folder capabilities by an application program.

6.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Uyen T. Le whose telephone number is 703-305-4134. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

7.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

20 February 2004

UYEN LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER